

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated June 17, 2004.

The Examiner has objected to the specification. The specification has been extensively revised to overcome this objection.

Further, the Examiner has objected to claims 1-7 because of informalities. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Moreover, the Examiner has stated that claims 1-5 and 7 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the above objections. In addition, the Examiner has stated that claim 6 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, and if claim 1 is rewritten to overcome the above objections. Claims 1-7 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 8-14 which are rewritten from original claims 1-7 in order to overcome the objections and rejections.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for examination, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



SIGNATURE

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

September 17, 2004